



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,425	10/16/2003	Nardo B. Catahan JR.	OJCO242US	2230
60975	7590	06/13/2008		
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP			EXAMINER	
11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE			DANNEMAN, PAUL	
BLDG. H, SUITE 250				
AUSTIN, TX 78758			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/688,425	CATAHAN ET AL.
	Examiner PAUL DANNEMAN	Art Unit 3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1648)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

1. This action is in response to the application filed on 16 October 2003.
2. Claims 1-28 have been examined.

Drawings

3. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because the drawings are hand drawn, hand annotated and the printed drawing have fonts which make the text illegible when scanned / copied. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Double Patenting

4. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

5. **Claims 1-28** provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-28 of copending Application No. 10/688,094. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 3627

6. **Claims 1-28** directed to the same invention as that of **claims 1-28** of commonly assigned **10/688,094**. The issue of priority under 35 U.S.C. 102(g) and possibly 35 U.S.C. 102(f) of this single invention must be resolved.

Since the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP Chapter 2300), the assignee is required to state which entity is the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter. A terminal disclaimer has no effect in this situation since the basis for refusing more than one patent is priority of invention under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) and not an extension of monopoly.

Failure to comply with this requirement will result in a holding of abandonment of this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. **Claims 1-9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions, a §101 process must:

- (1) Be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus), or
- (2) Transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 194 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876).

Claims 1-9 are method steps which are not tied to another statutory class and can be performed without a particular apparatus, therefore they fail the first prong of the new Federal Circuit decision.

9. **Claims 10, 11, and 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. **Claims 10, 11 and 12** have a data structure (functionally

descriptive material) stored on a machine-readable medium which does not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

12. **Claims 1-28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knauss et al., US 7,043,687 B2 hereafter known as Knauss.

13. **Examiner's note:** Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record in the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully

the **entire** reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the content of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

As per Claims 1-28, Knauss in at least FIG.3, Column 5, lines 64-67, and Column 6, lines 1-12 discloses a virtual document interface between applications and various types of messages or documents. Each application has a link to the virtual document interface, in which previously-defined mappings to variable of the virtual document are utilized in order to populate a target document or message, from a source document or message. Knauss in at least Column 6, lines 13-20 further discloses a system and method enabling automatic translation of EDI data to or from a self-describing markup language format such as XML, or an XML dialect, by way of a virtual document. Knauss in at least Column 5, lines 38-48 still further discloses that an EDI message is a data element and may be an invoice or purchase order. Each data element may represent a singular fact, such as a price, product, model number, and so forth.

Knauss in at least FIG.4 and Column 6, lines 36-51 further discloses links or mappings to the variables of a virtual document and to and from the source data model and the target data model.

Knauss in at least Column 9, lines 48-58 and Column 10, lines 1-3 further discloses that under control of the translator, values are written into the variables of the virtual document from the source data model in a data stream from the source data model to the target data model. Knauss in at least Column 9, lines 59-67 still further discloses that multiple target documents may be populated using data obtained from a single source document. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to one of ordinary skill in the art that Knauss provides a system and method for translating an invoice document from one format to another format for use by various applications in a manner similar to Applicant's invention.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Bahl et al., US 6,883,004 B2. Teaches an automated invoice receipt and management system.

Art Unit: 3627

- Virgin et al., US 6,826,542 B1. Teaches a System and Method for collecting, enhancing and distributing invoices electronically via the internet.
- XML/EDI Group. "Guidelines for using XML for Electronic Data Interchange." Presented at XML One—San Jose Sep/Oct 2001.
<http://web.archive.org/web/20040413182700/http://www.xml-edi-group.org/>
- Schwarzhoff et al., US 6,591,260 B1. Teaches a method of retrieving schemas for interpreting documents in an electronic commerce system.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAUL DANNEMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-1863. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. 6AM-5PM Fri. off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Florian Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Paul Danneman/
Examiner, Art Unit 3627

29 May 2008

/F. Ryan Zeender/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
3627